



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/509,869	06/15/2000	LENNART CARLSSON	1547/00268	1354

30678            7590            12/13/2002

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP  
SUITE 800  
1990 M STREET NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20036-3425

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

LUCCHESI, NICHOLAS D

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

3764

DATE MAILED: 12/13/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No. <b>09/509,869</b>	Applicant(s) <b>Carlsson et al</b>
	Examiner <b>Nick Lucchesi</b>	Art Unit <b>3732</b>
		
<i>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>		
<p>THE REPLY FILED <u>Nov 20, 2002</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.</p>		
<b>THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]</b>		
<p>a) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires <u>three</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.</p>		
<p>b) <input type="checkbox"/> The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).</p>		
<p>Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</p>		
<p>1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>Sep 25, 2002</u>. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.</p>		
<p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:</p>		
<p>(a) <input type="checkbox"/> they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);</p>		
<p>(b) <input type="checkbox"/> they raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);</p>		
<p>(c) <input type="checkbox"/> they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or</p>		
<p>(d) <input type="checkbox"/> they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</p>		
<p>NOTE: _____</p>		
<p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____</p>		
<p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).</p>		
<p>5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The a) <input type="checkbox"/> affidavit, b) <input type="checkbox"/> exhibit, or c) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>The claims still do not define over the O'Brien reference. See attached sheet.</u></p>		
<p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.</p>		
<p>7. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) <input type="checkbox"/> will not be entered or b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.</p>		
<p>The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:</p>		
<p>Claim(s) allowed: _____</p>		
<p>Claim(s) objected to: _____</p>		
<p>Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-16</u> _____</p>		
<p>Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____</p>		
<p>8. <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) <input type="checkbox"/> approved or b) <input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner.</p>		
<p>9. <input type="checkbox"/> Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____</p>		
<p>10. <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____</p>		

Art Unit: 3303

***Attachment To Advisory Action***

1. Applicant's arguments directed to the O'Brien reference have been considered. However, it is clear that O'Brien meets the claimed limitation of the conical part of the implant having "two or more thread spirals".

A broad interpretation of this limitation would simply require that the conical thread have two or more turns, since a single turn can be considered a "spiral". Thus, the conical portion of O'Brien can be said to have "two or more spirals".

Furthermore, if the intention of applicant is for the conical portion to have two or more different "threads", then a question may be raised as to the adequacy of the drawings, since they do not show this feature.



NICHOLAS D. LUCCHESI  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700